

Zionist Myths Examined

BY DR. JOHN NICHOLLS BOOTH

A sermon delivered in the Unitarian Church of Long Beach, California

*How long can Israel victimize the world
and command its support by cleverly ped-
dling myths as truths?*

NIXON has said in private that there are a lot of things the American public doesn't know about the Middle East, and ought to," wrote columnist Flora Lewis recently in the *Long Beach Press-Telegram*. "He seemed to chafe at the domestic political pressures on this foreign policy issue."

Rabbi Elmer Berger, a founder of the non-Zionist American Council for Judaism, has penned: "... there is the consistent practice of suppression of hard information about the Middle East by virtually all agencies of the United States government with any competence (particularly political) in the (Middle East) area (See *Anything But the Truth*, William McGaffin & Erwin Knoll, Putnam, N.Y. 1968, pp. 15-16, 76 ff.)."

As this sermon progresses you will begin to understand why our political, governmental, communications and even business institutions have felt the cold hand of censorship, threats or defamation in such a manner as to produce this dangerous shortage of necessary information. Within this domestic knowledge vacuum, myth information has been assiduously cultivated. Sadly, many kindly and highly intelligent persons have accepted the available materials as objective truth.

It is sixteen months since I last spoke to you on the Middle Eastern conflict area, a region that I have visited three times in a journalist's or photographer's

capacity. An examination of the invented stories in wide circulation in our society is long overdue from this pulpit. It will help to explain the seeming paradox that almost the entire world, now, excepting the U.S.A., Great Britain, Canada, South Africa and a few tiny states, has morally repudiated Israel and today stands behind the Arab states.

To allay questions, I have no connection with any Arabs, personal, institutional or governmental. No material has ever been requested from them. Indeed, only three or four have ever written to thank me for explaining their position. I write and speak without religious or ethnic nepotism biasing my judgment. Indeed, for serving my conscience and the moral issues involved I have had to face repeated insults and reprisals from American Zionists at many levels.

Spreading Half-Truths

A Long Beach rabbi helps spread the first half-truth of which I shall speak. In a letter dated June 8, 1967, he wrote that "Israel was created two decades ago by the overwhelming vote of the United Nations to provide a home for the remnant of the Hitler holocaust..." This refugee rabbi (who interestingly, like several hundred thousand other German Jews, did not choose Palestine for himself) leaves the impression that the world's nations eagerly, overwhelmingly wished to establish this state.

In his scholarly volume, *There Goes the Middle East* (Devin-Adair, N.Y., 1957, pp. 3-15) former State Department specialist Alfred M. Lilienthal details the cynical power drive exerted by American leaders under Zionist pressures to bring opposed or reluctant countries into line to vote for the creation of Israel in the United Nations. "Bernard Baruch," he writes, "was prevailed upon to 'talk' to the French—who could not afford to lose interim Marshall Plan aid. Other important Americans 'talked' to various countries, such as Haiti, Ethiopia, Paraguay, and Luxembourg, all dependent economically to one degree or another on the United States. Drew Pearson told in his . . . column how Adolph Berle 'talked' on the phone to Haiti's president . . . Harvey Firestone 'talked' with the government of Liberia, where he owned vast rubber plantations."

Pressure Is Exerted

Secretary Robert Lovett, at a Cabinet luncheon, reported that never in his life had he been subjected to as much pressure. Even President Truman complained, saying: "The Jewish pressure on the White House did not diminish in the days following the partition vote in the U.N. Individuals and groups asked me, usually in rather quarrelsome and emotional ways, to stop the Arabs, to keep the British from supporting the Arabs, to furnish American soldiers, to do this, that and the other."

The sordid manipulation continued. When Zionists discovered, via a straw vote, followed by a preliminary committee vote, that they lacked the two-thirds vote required for a resolution in the General Assembly, the session was cancelled and balloting delayed forty-eight hours to give time for more lobbying. Countries like Belgium, the Netherlands, Philippines, New Zealand and Thailand, were appalled by the immorality of setting up a theocratic gov-

ernment, along racially exclusive lines, for a minority of Jews in a region where the population was already two-thirds Arab Christians and Moslems. Diplomatically they tried to abstain if not oppose. But Americans went to work on them.

Israel, therefore, was born through intense manipulations and pressures, smashing past the moral questions, and using American economic and political power to fulfill Zionist wishes. Its justification was clouded from the very start.

The second widespread myth is repeated hopefully by Spencer Lavan in *The Register-Leader*, March 1968, page eight: "To us, there can be no question that the creation of Israel, at whatever cost, was righteous, just and in our own best interest as Americans . . ."

Without commenting on the cynical "at whatever cost," we cannot help wondering if the writer is aware of what this creation has cost the U.S.A. and the world? It has led to confrontations that could bring about World War III, convinced much of the globe that we are indeed an imperialist power without moral principles, created 1,500,000 tragic refugees, brought the U.S.S.R. overnight into both the Middle East and the Mediterranean, closed the Suez Canal, undermined, to their peril, the Jewish image around the world of a peaceful, spiritually - oriented people, and led to a warping of our own government's foreign policy. If this is the consequence of "righteous" and "just" acts we do live in a milieu of perverted values. Is this what we would help or defend?

Arab Lands Are Seized

A third prevalent myth about the Middle East was contained in a letter from an old and very dear friend of mine the other day. She argued that "the U.N. did not 'wrench territory from the Arabs' . . . It was Arab mili-

tants who created the plight of the Arab refugees."

Not just the right to sovereign control of the region was taken away from the Arab majority, by United Nations action. Israel seized more than 80% of the state's total area and more than two-thirds of its cultivable land owned by those Arab refugees who fled during the 1948 war period and can't return. This is the impartial, official conclusion of the 1951 Palestine Conciliation Commission of the United Nations. One third of Israel's Jewish population, in 1953, was living on absentee property and nearly one third of the new immigrants were settled in urban areas once occupied by Arabs who are now not allowed to return home.

Within two hours after the six day 1967 War broke out between Israel and the Arab states, General Moshe Dayan, Israeli Defense Minister, declared unequivocally: "We have no aims of territorial conquest." (*Newsweek*, Dec. 25, 1967, p.32) This is the fourth invented myth of Zionism commonly believed in the United States.

The events of history bely the integrity of Israeli claims to have no expansionist plans at Arab expense. Past declarations are even more incriminating. In Volume IV of the government work *FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES 1943: The Near East and Africa*, pp. 776-777, Ambassador Patrick Hurley wrote: "For its part, the Zionist Organization in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged program for: a) A sovereign Jewish state which would embrace Palestine, and probably Trans-jordan. b) An eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq. c) Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control."

It was the growing realization that my own support for Israel was based upon accepting these kinds of half truths and myth information as factual

that led to my agonizing change of sympathies in 1952. Immediately after Israel was founded in the Spring of 1948, and just before I left for almost a year of study touring and writing aboard, a small group of us held an informal observance for the new state in the Unitarian Church of Evanston, Illinois, which I was then serving.

Later, a lengthy article under my by-line in one of America's largest newspapers, the *Chicago Sun-Times*, (January 9, 1949) from Cairo, Egypt, reflected my pro-Israel bias. The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, whom I met for an interview, finally refused to answer my written questions on the grounds that they were "critical."

To increase the pro-Israel sentiment, our communications media, then as now, graphically enlarged upon any misconduct or threats of the Arab nations. A process of self-conditioning went on inside us, through sympathy with the Jewish plight under Hitler, that produced an anti-Arab bias. We knew that some Arab leaders had urged their followers in certain areas temporarily to move out of possible battle zones for their own safety. For this humanitarian act, which Israel has exploited shamefully ever since, Arab leaders do share some responsibility, but a creditable one, for the departures that created a refugee problem.

During the summer months of 1952, spent largely in Israel and the Arab countries, I discovered and became disenchanted for the first time with Israeli acts of inhumanity, the distortions of news and injustices toward Arabs that had been carefully screened out of the Middle East information circulating in the United States. Interestingly enough, most of the world's nations have gone through the same transformation of opinion as I have about the state of Israel. From positions of neutrality, disinterest or devoted enthusiasm, one by one they have lost respect for the twenty-one year old state's con-

duct and ethics. These countries are concerned with moral values and their absence. There is hope for humanity when one realizes that even a nation's outlawry is eventually condemned by almost every group on earth regardless of political ideology, ethnic background or previous assumptions.

In the September, 1968, issue of *The Voice of Judaism*, National Jewish Information Service for the Propagation of Judaism, we read: "To hate Israel is to hate God . . . To rise against Israel is to rise against God . . . To help Israel is to help God." (Sifre, Num., #84) This modest assumption of partnership with God helps to explain the "demand" that Christians and Americans must defend Israel or be smeared as anti-semitic.

Can Israel, the state, survive? The question is moot. The right question might become: if this is a moral universe, can a political entity which outrages mankind's highest sense of honor live? I would find it hard to believe in any form of God, if this situation could prevail indefinitely. If any nation vitiates continually the ethical standards by which civilized groups can alone work and live together, it must bring about its own doom eventually.

It is said that we have a commitment to defend Israel. Have we? "Senator Mike Mansfield reckons that any moral commitment we might once have had is less compelling than in the past," Richard Wilson reports with understatement in his column. "According to Mansfield, the United States does not have any hard and fast commitment to go to the aid of Israel or any other country in the Mideast, other than those which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

Arms Embargo

Italy imposed an embargo on Israel in 1967. France followed suit in 1968. Other countries have long since refused to make profits out of the Middle

east arms race. Great Britain, the United States, the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia are the chief armaments profiteers with blood on their hands. America could oblige Israel overnight to honor the resolutions of the United Nations, requesting her to withdraw from the territories she has invaded and restore to the refugees their rightful homes, businesses and lands, by simply imposing an arms embargo on her.

Informed Zionists well know that the U.S. government could bring Israel to heel almost instantly by invoking the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1941 and the later Export Control Act. These economic sanctions would shut off the enormous sums in American money exported to Israel by Jews. See *Challenge in the Middle East*, by Harry B. Ellis (Resident Correspondent in Beirut for the Christian Science Monitor,) The Ronald Press Co., N.Y., 1960 pgs. 97-98; chp. 5).

Since we have made no official pledge to Israel, Zionists' contention that the world would no longer have faith in U.S. promises if we do not come to that state's defense, amounts to rubbish. Indeed, the truth is the other way around! On May 23, 1967, just before the six day war started, President Lyndon B. Johnson solemnly declared: "To the leaders of all the nations of the Near East, I wish to say what American Presidents have said before me — that the United States is firmly committed to the territorial integrity of all nations of that area."

The noted English reformer, John Bright, declared in 1886: "If men build houses on the slopes of a Vesuvius, I may tell them of their folly and insecurity, but I am not in any way provoking, or responsible for, the eruption which sweeps them away." The warnings to world Jewry were many: President Roosevelt, for example, stated that, "in his opinion, a Jewish state in Palestine could be established and maintained only by military force."

If Israel dies, the world should not be too surprised; other nations, for lesser reasons, have ceased to be.

But there is still hope. If she will stop reversing the beatitudes, that is, applying moral standards to others that she violates herself; if she will show genuine compassion for, and exercise justice toward, the Arab refugees, their dignity and lives; if she will restore their properties; if she will respect the ethical standards of today rather than a magnified "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" vengeance of three thousand years ago; she may endure in revised form.

No nation can victimize world populations indefinitely, and command their affection or support, by cleverly peddling myths as truths. The fundamental

issue today is four-fold: there must be a return to truth telling; humanitarianism must replace callous indifference toward the property and return of refugees; civilized justice must prevail over gunboat diplomacy; and arrogance stop in ignoring international moral judgments concerning her. Until this happens, even continuance as a bi-national Arab-Jewish state, under another name and organization of government, is sharply in doubt.

ABOUT THE ABOVE ARTICLE

The above article is comprised of excerpts from an address by Dr. Booth. The entire sermon ("Zionist Myth Information Examined") is available for 15 cents per copy from the Unitarian Church of Long Beach, 5450 Atherton Street, Long Beach, Calif. 90815.

OPPORTUNITY

This I beheld, or dreamed it in a dream—
There spread a cloud of dust along a plain;
And underneath the cloud, or in it, raged
A furious battle, and men yelled, and swords
Shocked upon swords and shields. A prince's banner
Wavered, then staggered backward, hemmed by foes.

A craven hung along the battle's edge,
And thought, "Had I a sword of keener steel—
That blue blade that the king's son bears—but this
Blunt thing!"—he snapped and flung it from his hand,
And lowering crept away and left the field.

Then came the king's son, wounded, sore bestead
And weaponless, and saw the broken sword,
Hilt-buried in the dry and trodden sand,
And ran and snatched it, and with battle-shout
Lifted afresh he hewed his enemy down,
And saved a great cause that heroic day.

EDWARD ROWLAND SILL (1841-1887)